

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RAUL ANTHONY FLORES,

Defendant and Appellant.

B215588

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VA106110)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Philip H. Hickok, Judge. Affirmed.

Lenore De Vita, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On April 9, 2008, defendant Raul Anthony Flores was riding a bicycle and failed to stop at stop sign, a violation of Vehicle Code section 22450, subdivision (a). A police officer stopped him to issue a traffic citation and, with Flores's permission, searched his pockets for safety-related reasons. That search yielded a glass pipe with burn marks and what looked to the officer like the residue of methamphetamine, and a box containing sixty-one .22 caliber bullets.

Flores was charged with two criminal violations: count 1, felon in possession of ammunition (Pen. Code, § 12316, subd. (b)(1)); and count 2, possession of a smoking device (Health & Saf. Code, § 11364, subd. (a)), a misdemeanor. A jury convicted Flores on count 1. The jury was unable to reach a verdict on count 2. A mistrial was declared as to count 2, which was dismissed. (Pen. Code, § 1385.) Flores was sentenced to the middle term of two years as to count 1, and ordered to pay a fine and security fee. (Pen. Code, §§ 1202.4, subd. (b), 1465.8, subd. (a)(1).) A parole restitution fine was imposed under Penal Code section 1202.45, and stayed.

We appointed counsel to represent Flores on appeal. After examination of the record, Flores's counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues, and asking this court to independently review the record. On August 14, 2009, we advised Flores he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that Flores's counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities, and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, Acting P. J.

CHANEY, J.